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Introduction

Jefferson County Public Library (JCPL) conducts an annual benchmarking study as a tool to

- compare and evaluate key operating and performance indicators of library services and their value to the community by key measures of library use
- inform JCPL’s strategic planning process
- monitor progress against the overall goal of performing at or above the 50th percentile of a pool of comparative public peer libraries in key performance areas
- identify trends, key areas of opportunity and focus in the allocation of future resources

The Benchmarking Study 2017 uses national library data published annually by the Public Library Data Service (PLDS) www.plametrics.org. The data is collected through an annual online survey which is administered by the Center for Informatics Research in Science and Scholarship (CIRSS) at the University of Illinois, and is run on behalf of the Public Library Association (PLA). Participation in the survey is voluntary. In 2017 a total of 4,717 US libraries completed the questionnaire.

JCPL conducted a benchmarking study of a sample of eleven national libraries in 2017, including JCPL. The study compares key data from finances, resources, technology, library services and use, based on 2017 fiscal year data.

Peer selection

As in previous years, JCPL’s peer group was selected based on operating revenue per capita and population size, acknowledging these variables as most significant in extracting a comparative group of benchmarking peers from the PLDS dataset of public libraries.

Revenue per capita as the relative spending power based on population size, determines investment capabilities. Population size is generally important when absolute numbers are benchmarked to establish a certain level of comparability.

In the past we have consistently used a range of +/- 20 percent from JCPL’s annual revenue per capita and the population size to select our peer group for benchmarking. This approach facilitates dynamic benchmarking where the peer group changes with the changes JCPL experiences in those selection parameters year over year. For 2017 this method of peer selection rendered only 3 peers. JCPL’s operating revenue per capita increase of 4 percent from 2016 to 2017 had pushed a number of peers just outside of our defined range. In order to gain a meaningful number of peers
for benchmarking, JCPL decided to extend the range for 2017 and to allow for a +/- 22 percent range from JCPL’s operating revenue per capita. This change resulted in a pool of 11 peers including JCPL.

As in past years JCPL’s two most comparative local libraries, Pikes Peak Library District and Denver Public Library, are part of the benchmarking group, which allows for comparison with libraries local to Colorado. It needs to be noted that Pikes Peak had to be specifically added this year because their operating revenue per capita was slightly below the range set for peer selection in 2017.

For the purpose of this study the selection criteria “population” is defined as the number of people residing in the Legal Service Area (LSA) of a public library. For JCPL the LSA refers to Jefferson County. The selection criteria “operating revenue per capita” refers to the funds received for operating the libraries, broken down to reflect the available budget per county resident.

**Peer group**

The benchmarking peers including JCPL were selected based on a defined range of:

- **Population LSA +/- 22 percent of JCPL’s**
  
  (578,101 in 2017, range 450,919 – 705,283)

- **Operating revenue per capita +/-22 percent of JCPL’s**
  
  ($65.44 in 2017; range $51.04 - $79.83)

Eleven public libraries including JCPL were selected as part of the 2017 benchmarking peer group. The following graphs show JCPL’s placement in the 2017 peer group in the upper range of operating revenue per capita, and in the lower range of the group in terms of size of population served. There are no new peers to the group in 2017.
The following three 2016 peers are no longer included in the 2017 benchmarking data set due to falling outside the defined range for operating revenue per capita:

- **OK – TULSA CITY COUNTY LIBRARY SYSTEM**
- **WA - FORT VANCOUVER REGIONAL LIBRARY DISTRICT**
- **WA - TIMBERLAND REGIONAL LIBRARY**

As mentioned previously, the following Colorado public library is included specifically in the 2017 peer set, even though slightly outside the defined revenue per capita this year. This library has been an important local benchmarking partner since 2012, which drove the decision for making this exception.

- **CO – PIKES PEAK LIBRARY DISTRICT**
Executive summary

After years of budget constraints, reduced open hours, and cuts in collection and staffing expenditures, 2016 marked the beginning of a higher budget era for JCPL which resulted from the successful passing of the mill levy in November 2015. In April 2016 the expanded public service hour schedule was implemented, and 2017 was the first full year of JCPL operating on extended hours. JCPL also realized its first comprehensive and large-scale remodeling project for Columbine, one of its biggest library branches in 2017.

JCPL’s strategic focus for 2017 was to invest in its collection. The extent of these investments was significant. JCPL spent the highest amount of all peers on library materials in 2017, and allocated the highest percentage of operating expenditures towards the collection. Compared to the previous year the collection budget increased by 43 percent, and the collection size was increased by 6 percent. The community response is measured in the use of library materials. The industry has experienced a declining trend in circulations for the past 6 years (www.plametrics.org), but JCPL was able to increase circulation by 1 percent from 2016. When benchmarked against its peer libraries, JCPL emerged as a clear leader in collection use, with the highest circulation per capita, confirming not only the choices made for the collection, but also their value for the community.

Following JCPL’s strategic focus on the collection in 2017, investments on staffing and additional hires remained conservative. JCPL allocated the 2nd lowest percentage of operating expenditures towards salaries and benefits. A third-party organizational analysis was conducted to gain insights on how to structure JCPL in the future, anticipating growth of the organization.

Operating revenue and expenditures:

JCPL recorded the 3rd highest revenue per capita of the 2017 peer group, showing JCPL on the high end in relative spending capacity based on population size. JCPL’s operating expenditures per capita were 9th lowest in comparison benchmarked against the peer libraries, reflecting more conservative spending which was intentional due to a number of capital investments made in 2017, such as the remodel of Columbine, technology investments and maintenance projects.

JCPL continued to demonstrate a high level of market penetration. JCPL ranked 4th highest in active cardholders as percent of the population served when compared to the peer libraries. This speaks to a very engaged relationship between JCPL and its community and explains the successful ranking of JCPL observed in all library use measures.
Measures of community value:

- **Use of materials**

  JCPL ranked 1st in circulation per capita measuring the return on the collection investments made in 2017. The purchased materials included physical and e-materials recognizing increasing demand in these material types. Electronic circulation showed a significant increase, which confirmed the observed industry trend (www.plametrics.org) towards using digital media, and was facilitated by specific purchases in this segment. JCPL also ranked 1st in total collection use, which included the databases in addition to physical and electronic materials, and was a clear testimony to the investments and purchasing selections made by JCPL for its 2017 collection.

- **Visits**

  JCPL ranked 6th in physical visits per capita. When related to its capacity of hours, JCPL ranked as 2nd busiest library per public service hour in comparison to the peer libraries. The high visits-per-hour ratio would hint at imminent limitations with current public service hours per branch. JCPL had the 4th highest website visits per capita in the benchmarking comparison. Both physical and virtual visits speak to the level of awareness and use of the library by the community.

- **Program attendance**

  JCPL has always shown a strong commitment to programming as a way to connect, educate, support, and build relationships with its community. JCPL offered the 7th highest number of programs per 1,000 capita, and had the 6th highest number of program attendees per capita compared to the benchmarking peers in 2017. These results underscore community engagement in programming and speak to the continued success of JCPL programming as an important and integral part of library services.
### Summary data table 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Population of legal service area (LSA)</td>
<td>578,101</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>579,103</td>
<td>622,104</td>
<td>672,344</td>
<td>44,003</td>
<td>-7%</td>
<td>6,642</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>578,101</td>
<td>571,459</td>
<td>565,535</td>
<td>548,557</td>
<td>537,219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active cardholders</td>
<td>320,551</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>280,339</td>
<td>320,551</td>
<td>362,321</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>41,330</td>
<td>-11%</td>
<td>320,551</td>
<td>361,881</td>
<td>350,433</td>
<td>341,446</td>
<td>332,503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active cardholders as % of population</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>-8%</td>
<td>-12%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library square footage per capita</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>-43%</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-1%</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating revenue per capita</td>
<td>$65.44</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>$51.36</td>
<td>$62.95</td>
<td>$65.20</td>
<td>$2.49</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>$9.01</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>$65.44</td>
<td>$66.42</td>
<td>$44.16</td>
<td>$45.24</td>
<td>$47.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating expenditures per capita</td>
<td>$52.36</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$49.83</td>
<td>$52.36</td>
<td>$65.12</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>$6.33</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>$52.36</td>
<td>$46.03</td>
<td>$42.64</td>
<td>$38.83</td>
<td>$43.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FTE per 1,000 capita</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>-17%</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collection size per capita</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>-18%</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>2.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Website visits per capita (including catalog sessions as of 2017)</td>
<td>7.92</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>5.87</td>
<td>9.91</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>3,051,188</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>7.82</td>
<td>5.34</td>
<td>5.04</td>
<td>5.87</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visits per capita</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>5.38</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>-2%</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>4.60</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>4.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circulation per capita (physical and electronic)</td>
<td>13.79</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.09</td>
<td>10.30</td>
<td>12.24</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>13.79</td>
<td>13.83</td>
<td>12.74</td>
<td>13.49</td>
<td>14.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circulation per year (physical and electronic)</td>
<td>7,971,823</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4,767,388</td>
<td>6,058,728</td>
<td>7,048,577</td>
<td>1,913,095</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>70,910</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>7,971,823</td>
<td>7,900,913</td>
<td>7,202,744</td>
<td>7,402,527</td>
<td>7,589,979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Database retrievals</td>
<td>1,340,100</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>401,332</td>
<td>418,225</td>
<td>681,748</td>
<td>921,876</td>
<td>220%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1,340,100</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total collection use</td>
<td>9,311,923</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5,180,768</td>
<td>6,615,212</td>
<td>7,220,983</td>
<td>2,696,711</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>9,311,923</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total collection use per capita</td>
<td>16.11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.93</td>
<td>10.92</td>
<td>12.85</td>
<td>5.19</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>16.11</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programs per 1,000 capita</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>-3%</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program attendance per 1,000 capita</td>
<td>423</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>423</td>
<td>481</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>16.07</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>423</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>368</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>307</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Benchmarking measures 2017

Operating revenue, Operating expenditures

JCPL had 3rd highest operating revenue per capita, but conservative operating expenses at the median (6th rank) of the peer group, due to capital investments in 2017.

For JCPL this was the second year of operating on a higher budget after successfully passing a mill levy at the end of 2015. JCPL spent conservatively at the median of the peer group (6th rank). A comparatively big contribution was made towards the library materials budget, while the approach for staff expenditures remained conservative.

- Total operating revenue increased by 17 percent from 2016 to $37,829,859 in 2017.
- JCPL’s had the 3rd highest operating revenue per capita of $65.44.
- Total operating expenditures increased by 15 percent from 2016 to $30,270,786 in 2017.
- JCPL ranked at the median for operating expenditures per capita of $52.35.
- $7,068,226 of operating revenue was dedicated to capital projects.

Material expenditures

JCPL had highest material expenditures (1st rank), reflecting the focus on the collection in 2017, and generating high collection use.

The 2017 budget focused on the collection. JCPL allocated 27.41 percent of operating expenditures towards materials. The allocation to materials by JCPL was approximately twice as high as the percentage of operating expenses the median of the peer group allocated towards material expenditures. In comparison PLDS studies (www.plametrics.org) have found 12 percent material expenditures of operating expenditures to be the common general industry average.

- Total material expenditures increased by 43 percent from 2016 to $8,296,242 in 2017.
- Total collection size increased by 6 percent from 2016 to 1,128,974 items in 2017.

The purchases made for the collection included physical as well as electronic materials and databases. JCPL’s collection size marked below the 25th percentile in 2017. By making investments in electronic materials and databases JCPL has been able to increase access to materials under the current facility constraints of square footage and branches.
The community response was measured in the use of library materials.

Collection Use

JCPL ranked 1st in Circulation per capita (measuring physical and electronic materials),
JCPL ranked 1st in Total collection use per capita (measuring physical, electronic materials, and databases)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2017 Benchmarking Peers</th>
<th>Material expenses</th>
<th>Collection Size</th>
<th>Circulation per capita</th>
<th>Collection use per capita</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JCPL Rank*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALAMEDA COUNTY LIBRARY</td>
<td>$4,159,919</td>
<td>1,238,782</td>
<td>10.44</td>
<td>10.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DENVER PUBLIC LIBRARY</td>
<td>$4,136,774</td>
<td>15,808,507</td>
<td>7.08</td>
<td>7.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIERCE COUNTY LIBRARY SYSTEM</td>
<td>$4,123,054</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>12.90</td>
<td>14.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIKES PEAK LIBRARY DISTRICT*</td>
<td>$5,621,441</td>
<td>1,783,820</td>
<td>13.55</td>
<td>14.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEE COUNTY LIBRARY SYSTEM</td>
<td>$2,969,346</td>
<td>2,198,454</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>3.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BOSTON PUBLIC LIBRARY</td>
<td>$4,322,354</td>
<td>1,827,512</td>
<td>9.58</td>
<td>10.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENOCH PRATT FREE LIBRARY</td>
<td>$5,171,237</td>
<td>2,261,878</td>
<td>7.10</td>
<td>7.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCEAN COUNTY LIBRARY</td>
<td>$3,416,977</td>
<td>1,281,926</td>
<td>7.07</td>
<td>8.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAYTON METRO LIBRARY</td>
<td>$3,818,597</td>
<td>1,292,420</td>
<td>10.30</td>
<td>10.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NASHVILLE PUBLIC LIBRARY</td>
<td>$4,393,635</td>
<td>1,046,934</td>
<td>11.58</td>
<td>11.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JCPL 2017</td>
<td>$8,296,242</td>
<td>1,128,974</td>
<td>13.79</td>
<td>16.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JCPL 2016</td>
<td>$5,816,450</td>
<td>1,067,295</td>
<td>13.83</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25th Percentile 2017</td>
<td>$3,970,826</td>
<td>1,249,568</td>
<td>7.09</td>
<td>7.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50th Percentile (MEDIAN) 2017</td>
<td>$4,159,919</td>
<td>1,538,120</td>
<td>10.30</td>
<td>10.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75th Percentile 2017</td>
<td>$4,782,436</td>
<td>2,105,719</td>
<td>12.24</td>
<td>12.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Δ JCPL- Median (2017)</td>
<td>$4,136,323</td>
<td>-409,146</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>5.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Δ JCPL- Median (2017)</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>-27%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Δ JCPL (2017-2016)</td>
<td>$2,479,792</td>
<td>61,679</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Δ JCPL (2017-2016)</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>-0.26%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

JCPL saw a high return on the collection investments made, recording the highest circulation per capita for physical and electronic items in 2017. PLDS started to measure the number of database retrievals in 2017, which enables us to evaluate total collection use for the first time. Total collection use is adding the number of database retrievals to the circulation numbers of physical and electronic
materials. Database retrievals capture full text retrievals or downloads, record views, full record accessed, videos watched, lessons viewed, and include learning databases like Lynda.com.

- JCPL circulated a total of 7,971,823 physical and electronic items in 2017.
- JCPL’s Circulation per capita was 13.79 items.
- Total database use was 1,340,100 retrievals.
- Total collection use per capita was 16.11 items. (including databases)

It needs to be noted that JCPL showed the highest (1st rank) circulation per capita in the peer group with the 2nd smallest collection size and the smallest square footage of public library space.

JCPL had not only made substantial investments in the collection in 2017, but also set initiatives to connect customers with the collection through staff expertise, better promotion and marketing of the library materials, and by improving navigation support for digital browsing. The frequent collection use confirmed ease of access to the materials, the selection of the materials, and the community’s increased awareness of the collection.

Staff expenditures

JCPL had lowest staff expenditures (10th rank) in comparison to the peer libraries, reflecting conservative hiring in 2017.

JCPL allocated 53.09 percent of operating expenses towards staff salaries and benefits, reflecting JCPL’s conservative approach for staff expenditures, while a third-party organizational analysis was under way to provide input to JCPL’s organizational development and future structure anticipating growth of the organization. JCPL ranked 10th lowest in staff expenditures, remaining below the 25th percentile of the peer libraries, and also below the general library average ranging from 60-70 percent of operating expenditures commonly in PLDS studies (www.plametrics.org).

PLDS counts FTE as the Full Time staff equivalent to actual worked hours, calculated for a 40 hour work week, and annualized over the 52 weeks of the year. The 2017 FTE count for JCPL represented staffing for a first full year of the expanded public service hours schedule.

- JCPL’s staff expenditures amounted to $16,071,770 in 2017.
- JCPL counted 256 FTE in 2017, and
- 0.44 FTE per 1,000 capita.
Program attendance

JCPL ranked 6th in program attendance per 1,000 capita, and offered the 7th highest number of programs per 1,000 capita.

The number of JCPL programs offered increased 9 percent from 2016, which can be partly attributed to 2017 being the first full year operating on expanded hours. Program attendance increased by 5 percent from 2016.

- JCPL offered a total number of 10,759 programs in 2017, and
- 19 programs per 1,000 capita.

JCPL offered the 7th highest number of programs per 1,000 capita, and had the 6th highest number of program attendance per 1,000 capita.

- 244,503 people attended JCPL programs in 2017, and
- 423 program attendance per 1,000 capita.

These results speak to the continued success of JCPL programming which has always been an important and integral part of JCPL library services.
Market penetration

JCPL recorded 4th highest number of active cardholders as a percentage of population after 2017 customer database maintenance.

In 2017 JCPL counted 320,551 registered cardholders, and marked at the median of the benchmarking peer group with this number. Compared to 2016, JCPL recorded a decrease in cardholders by 11 percent, which can be attributed to the deletion of 72,019 inactive cards for annual customer database maintenance. With a number of cardholders equivalent to 55 percent of Jefferson County residents, JCPL recorded the 4th highest number of cardholders in percent of population. This data point shows a high level of market penetration when related to the population and when compared to the peer group. It speaks to the high level of engagement of the community with JCPL and the services offered.
Visits

JCPL was the 6th most visited library compared to the peer group, but recorded the highest number of physical visits per square footage.

Visits are one of the measures of community value (besides collection use, and program attendance) that can be used to profile a library and to evaluate customer satisfaction with library services indirectly.

- JCPL recorded a total of 2,608,238 physical visits in 2017, and
- 4.51 visits per capita.

JCPL ranked 6th in visits per capita, but when measuring visits based on square footage of public library space, JCPL ranked 1st of the benchmarking group. JCPL had the most visits per square foot, the highest foot traffic.

Website visits have gained increased importance over the last years with readers developing a growing affinity towards digital collection services, online browsing of events and items, and managing their library accounts. The measure of website visits has been changed to include catalog browsing in 2017, when it had been excluded from the count previously.

- JCPL recorded a total of 4,518,931 website visits in 2017, and
- 7.82 visits per capita.

JCPL recorded the 4th highest number of website visits per capita.

Facilities and Public service hours

JCPL shows limitations with 10th lowest square footage per capita, and 3rd highest public service hours per square footage.

Given the growth of the Jefferson County population over the past decades, JCPL continues to fall behind with its existing facilities. No expansions have been made since 1991. In 2017 JCPL began to work on a Facility Master Plan to plan for additional services needed to support population growth.

- JCPL operated the smallest number of branches (10) in 2017, while
- the median of the peers marked at 20 branches.
- JCPL ranked 10th smallest library with 0.38 square feet per capita.
JCPL had 220,907 square feet in 2017, and would need to add 167,395 square feet to meet the median square footage.

Square footage is an important parameter when comparing with other libraries as there are many key indicators that are influenced by it, for example size of collection, circulation, service hours, program attendance, and visits.

Based on the current square footage, JCPL showed high utilization of its space.

- JCPL offered the 3rd highest number of public service hours per 1,000 square foot, and
- marked above the 75th percentile of the peer group.

This shows that JCPL is maximizing hours per outlet compared to the majority of the peer libraries, and again hints at future limitations given population growth.

- JCPL ranked 2nd lowest in public service hours offered per 1,000 capita, and
- remained below the 25th percentile.
Appendix

Methodology

This report presents benchmarking data from a sample of eleven US public libraries, including JCPL, frequently referred to as “peer group” or “benchmarking group” in this document. The benchmarking study is based on library data from the 2017 fiscal year, historic JCPL data is provided additionally when available.

JCPL is using rank within and deviation from the comparison peer group based on the calculated median (50th percentile) for benchmarking. JCPL strives to meet or surpass the median value of the peer libraries. The 75th percentile is used as a secondary measure of “best library performance” and as such a data point JCPL aspires to reach over time with capital projects and investments that are realized or take effect gradually over time.

For the purpose of obtaining a quick benchmarking point, JCPL is ranked within the peer group for every benchmarking parameter. The table below references relation to the median for all ranks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JCPL Ranking against peers</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Above 50th Percentile</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median (50th Percentile)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below 50th Percentile</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Within the peer group of eleven, when ranked 1-5, JCPL would mark above the 50th percentile, when ranked 7-11, JCPL would mark below the 50th percentile. The 6th rank represents the median. The median is referred to as the 50th percentile interchangeably in this document, and marks the midpoint in the data where 50% of the data fall below this point, and 50% fall above it.

In this report JCPL is benchmarked primarily against the median, while aiming to meet or surpass it. The difference to the median is illustrated in the tables provided throughout the report, with green color coding for “at or above the median” and red color coding for “below the median”. This allows for a quick reference as to JCPL’s relative position to the median. The Summary data table focuses on per capita ratios of which many are also part of the Strategic Scorecard.

A Comprehensive data table displays the peer libraries’ individual data, and provides annual counts in addition to the corresponding per capita ratios. Per capita ratios measure a library’s capability of serving its population or community, as they help put absolute values into perspective to population size. Per capita ratios also measure whether the annual counts of any given parameter can sustain population growth over time.
## Comprehensive data table 2017

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Denver Public Library</td>
<td>4,750,181</td>
<td>5,327,717</td>
<td>5,330,113</td>
<td>5,994,485</td>
<td>794,374</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alameda County Free Library</td>
<td>1,340,100</td>
<td>1,830,992</td>
<td>2,068,739</td>
<td>2,683,993</td>
<td>643,864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pierce County Library</td>
<td>8,911,970</td>
<td>9,544,430</td>
<td>9,800,117</td>
<td>10,312,792</td>
<td>5,202,822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson County Public Library</td>
<td>7,008,181</td>
<td>7,654,321</td>
<td>8,210,417</td>
<td>9,119,092</td>
<td>9,097,920</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2017 Benchmarking Parameters

#### Population & Library Data

- **Population**: 987,013 (2017)
- **Cardholders per year**: 243,512
- **Library square footage**: 6,058,728
- **Circulation per capita**: 1.03
- **Programs per year**: 10.92
- **Program attendance per capita**: 2.49
- **Staff expenditures per FTE**: 0.44
- **Material expenditures per cap**: 0.35
- **Operating expenditures per capita**: 2.49
- **Website visits per capita**: 2.49
- **Website visists per capita**: 2.49

#### Collection & E-Resource Data

- **Collection size per capita**: 2.61
- **Website visits per capita**: 2.49
- **Website visists per capita**: 2.49

#### Service Data

- **Circulation per capita**: 1.03
- **Programs per year**: 10.92
- **Program attendance per capita**: 2.49
- **Staff expenditures per FTE**: 0.44
- **Material expenditures per cap**: 0.35
- **Operating expenditures per capita**: 2.49
- **Website visits per capita**: 2.49
- **Website visists per capita**: 2.49

### Additional Notes

- The benchmarking data includes data from various library systems across the United States.
- Benchmarks are calculated based on various metrics such as circulation, program attendance, and operating expenditures.
- The data is presented in a table format, with columns indicating different categories and rows representing the respective values.
- The data is provided for the years 2014 to 2017, allowing for a comparison over time.